

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13, and 15-17 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is independent. Claim 3 has been canceled, no claims have been added, and claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Uchida (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054028) in view of Labeeb et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093792) in further view of Chimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,531,590). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Uchida in view of Labeeb and Chimoto and in further view of Yap et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0092021). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Argument: Features of claim 1 not disclosed by cited prior art

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include dependent claim 3. The Examiner relies on Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto for allegedly disclosing the (amended) claimed invention of independent claim 1. However, the cited prior art (Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto) fails to disclose the (amended) claimed invention of independent claim 1.

Uchida (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054028)

The invention as disclosed in Uchida is directed to cause a display apparatus to display operation display information (a control panel) for receiving an operation input from a user to a base apparatus or the like.

When a control panel is displayed, information for displaying the control panel is supplied from a control section 130 to an OSD processing section 105 in a display apparatus as illustrated in Figure 2 of Uchida. The information is synthesized with a video signal by the OSD processing section 105, so as to be displayed on an LCD 107. (See Uchida, paragraph 47.)

Specifically, when an STB 300 is controlled, information on the control panel for controlling the STB 300 is supplied from the control section 130 to the OSD processing section 105. The information is synthesized with the video signal by the OSD processing section 105, so as to be displayed on the LCD 107. (See Uchida, paragraphs 48-49.)

Similarly, when a base apparatus 200 is controlled, information on the control panel for controlling the base apparatus 200 is supplied from the control section 130 to the OSD processing section 105. The information is synthesized with the video signal by the OSD processing section 105, so as to be displayed on the LCD 107. (See Uchida, paragraph 57.)

As described earlier, what is synthesized with the video signal by the OSD processing section 105 of a display apparatus 100 is unchanged given information on the control panel for controlling the STB 300 or the base apparatus 200 which information has already been stored in the control section 130. Namely, EPG data received along with the video signal is not supplied from the control section 130 to the OSD processing section of the display apparatus 100. Accordingly, the EPG data, which is not processed by the OSD processing section 105 of the display apparatus 100, is not synthesized with the video signal.

The record should show that paragraphs 74 and 91 of Uchida which are cited by the Examiner clearly state that the EPG data is processed, that is, a display of EPG is formed by the OSD processing section 105 of the STB 300. (See Uchida, Figure 4.)

In contrast, according to the claimed invention, the EPG data is not processed by a set-top box though the set-top box can be connected to a base device via an input terminal. Namely, the EPG data is wirelessly transmitted, along with first video data, from a transmitting unit of the base device to a wireless terminal including a display unit. Thereafter, the EPG data is processed by the wireless terminal, so as to be formed as a display of EPG.

Labeeb et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093792)

Labeeb discloses that a set top box 34 which is connected to a cable head end includes an EPG memory 36 and a template memory 38. (See Labeeb, paragraph 167 and Figure 2.) Namely, a display of EPG is not formed in a television in Labeeb as in the case of Uchida.

Labeeb is different from the claimed invention in that, not wireless communication, but wire communication is made between each of the cable head end and an STB and the television.

Chimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,531,590)

Chimoto (which is newly cited this time) merely discloses that EPG data is displayed by superimposing the EPG data over a video signal. Namely, Chimoto fails to disclose that the video data and the EPG data are wirelessly transmitted from the base device to the wireless terminal, at which the EPG data is superimposed over the video data.

Accordingly, a feature obtained by combining Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto resides in that a set-top box, which includes an EPG memory and a template memory, forms a video signal over which EPG data is superimposed and then the video signal is wirelessly transmitted to a display apparatus. Such a feature is totally different from the feature of the claimed invention which the feature resides in that the first video data and the EPG data are wirelessly transmitted from the base device to the wireless terminal, at which the second video image generated from the EPG data is superimposed over a first video image generated from the first video data.

Further, neither Uchida nor Labeeb discloses that the EPG data is synthesized with the video signal. Chimoto fails to disclose that the video data and the EPG data are wirelessly transmitted from the base device to the wireless terminal. Accordingly, it is impossible to recognize, from Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto, an object of the claimed invention of suppressing deterioration of a response for carrying out, on a display section, display of first video and second video superposed on the first video. (See the description at page 5, lines 7-9 of the English specification as originally filed.)

Thus, the combination of Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto, individually or in any combination, fails to disclose the claimed invention of independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 13 and 15-17 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regards to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 13 and 15-17 are respectfully requested for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Therefore, for at least these reasons, all claims are believed to be distinguishable over the combination of Uchida, Labeeb, and Chimoto, individually or in any combination. It has been shown above that the cited references, individually or in combination, may not be relied upon to show at least these features. Therefore, claims 1, 13 and 15-17 are distinguishable over the cited references.

In view of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the pending application be allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Aslan Ettehadieh (Reg. No. 62,278) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: October 4, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By



Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000